

**REMARKS**

This response is intended as a full and complete response to the final Office Action mailed July 24, 2006. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-35, 39, 41-48, and 50 are pending and rejected. Applicant traverses all of the rejections in the Office Action and respectfully requests reconsideration and passage of the claims to allowance for the following reasons.

***Claims Patentable over Sridhar under §102***

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 3, 4, 7-13, 15-17, 19-32, 39, 41, 43-48 and 50 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,324,582 to Sridhar et al. (hereinafter "Sridhar").

"Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim." The Sridhar reference fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, as arranged in the claim.

The Sridhar reference discloses an enhanced network communication. Embodiments of the Sridhar reference involve communication between a client application and a server application over a data network, such as the Internet. Sridhar teaches parsing a requested web page to find embedded references to images or other objects on that web page that are extracted. (See Sridhar, col. 14, ll. 16-47.) These embedded references are then requested by the remote communication server and the server computer forwards the data to be buffered. (See *Id.*) The data is effectively "prefetched" in anticipation of the client application on the client computer requesting the data. (See *Id.*)

The Sridhar arrangement fails to disclose or suggest the invention of claim 1, as follows:

1. A method for receiving data via multiple channel broadcast media, comprising:  
receiving a request for a desired data object, said desired data object being associated with a first-level name;

obtaining a plurality of second-level names associated with said first-level name, each second-level names being associated with one of a plurality of low-level data objects, said low-level data objects being in order by retrieval priority; and

obtaining location information associated with said second-level names via a first broadcast channel, said location Information identifying at least two of multiple broadcast channels for carrying data associated with said low-level data objects;

wherein said desired data object is a web page comprising at least a portion of said low-level data objects for retrieval and display in order defined by said retrieval priority.

In contrast to the above-quoted claim language, the Sridhar arrangement fails to disclose or suggest at least the step of "said low-level data objects being in order by retrieval priority" or "wherein said desired data object is a web page comprising at least a portion of said low-level data objects for retrieval and display in order defined by said retrieval priority", as positively claimed by Applicant's independent claim 1. Sridhar only teaches that data is "prefetched" by being buffered in anticipation of being requested by the client computer. (See Sridhar, col. 14, ll. 16-47.) However, Sridhar fails to teach or to suggest that the "prefetching" of data occurs in any particular retrieval order.

As such, Sridhar fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations found in the invention of claim 1. Independent claims 22, 31, 39, 48 and 50 recite relevant limitations similar to those recited in independent claim 1 and, as such, for at least the reasons discussed above, the Sridhar arrangement also fails to disclose or suggest the invention of claims 22, 31, 39, 48 and 50. Since dependent claims 3, 4, 7-13, 15-17, 19-21, 23-30, 32, 41, and 43-47 depend from claims 1, 22, 31 and 39 and recite additional limitations therefrom, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also patentable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

As such, Applicant submits that claims 1, 3, 4, 7-13, 15-17, 19-32, 39, 41, 43-48 and 50 are not anticipated and fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §102 and are patentable thereunder. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

***Claims Patentable over Sridhar/Zigmond under §103***

The Office Action rejected claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sridhar in view of U.S. Patent 6,785,902 to Zigmond et al. (hereinafter "Zigmond").

This ground of rejection applies only to independent claims and is predicated on the validity of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 based upon Sridhar. Since the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 based upon Sridhar has been overcome, as described hereinabove, and there is no argument put forth by the Office Action that the additional reference supplies that which is missing from Sridhar to render the independent claims obvious, this ground of rejection cannot be maintained. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

***Claims Patentable over Sridhar/Altschuler under §103***

The Office Action rejected claims 18, 33 and 34 as being unpatentable over Sridhar in view of U.S. Patent 6,778,971 to Altschuler et al. (hereinafter "Altschuler").

This ground of rejection applies only to independent claims and is predicated on the validity of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 based upon Sridhar. Since the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 based upon Sridhar has been overcome, as described hereinabove, and there is no argument put forth by the Office Action that the additional reference supplies that which is missing from Sridhar to render the independent claims obvious, this ground of rejection cannot be maintained. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

***Claim Patentable over Sridhar/Ikeda under §103***

The Office Action rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sridhar in view of U.S. Patent 6,212,681 to Ikeda (hereinafter "Ikeda").

This ground of rejection applies only to independent claims and is predicated on the validity of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 based upon Sridhar. Since the

rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 based upon Sridhar has been overcome, as described hereinabove, and there is no argument put forth by the Office Action that the additional reference supplies that which is missing from Sridhar to render the independent claims obvious, this ground of rejection cannot be maintained. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

***Claim Patentable over Sridhar/Boon under §103***

The Office Action rejected claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sridhar in view of U.S. Patent 6,351,565 to Boon (hereinafter "Boon").

This ground of rejection applies only to independent claims and is predicated on the validity of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 based upon Sridhar. Since the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 based upon Sridhar has been overcome, as described hereinabove, and there is no argument put forth by the Office Action that the additional reference supplies that which is missing from Sridhar to render the independent claims obvious, this ground of rejection cannot be maintained. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

***Claim Patentable over Sridhar/Bisdikian under §103***

The Office Action rejected claim 42 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sridhar in view of U.S. Patent 6,047,317 to Bisdikian et al. (hereinafter "Bisdikian").

This ground of rejection applies only to independent claims and is predicated on the validity of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 based upon Sridhar. Since the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 based upon Sridhar has been overcome, as described hereinabove, and there is no argument put forth by the Office Action that the additional reference supplies that which is missing from Sridhar to render the independent claims obvious, this ground of rejection cannot be maintained. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and passage of the claims to allowance. If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Eamon J. Wall or Jimmy Kim at (732) 530-9404 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

9/14/06

EJWall

Eamon J. Wall, Attorney  
Reg. No. 39,414  
(732) 530-9404

Patterson & Sheridan, LLP  
Attorneys at Law  
595 Shrewsbury Avenue, Suite 100  
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702